



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,521	09/23/2003	Hugh Trout III	23660-00656	1449
25243	7590	12/12/2006	EXAMINER	
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP 3050 K STREET, NW SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20007			TYSON, MELANIE RUANO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/667,521	TROUT ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Melanie Tyson	3731	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/6/04. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference sign(s) 52 mentioned in the description in paragraph 50, and they include the reference character(s) 54 in Figure 8A not mentioned in the description. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains legal phraseology (comprises, lines 2, 4, and 6). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

4. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "expands into a substantially closed configuration" is contradictory. According to Merriam-Webster dictionary, the term "expands" means to "open" up, or to "open" out. Therefore, to "expand" into a "closed" position is a contradictory statement. The claim has been interpreted as "expands into a substantially open configuration" for examination purposes. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-5, 10-13, and 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Purdy (Patent No. 5,693,067). Purdy discloses an occlusive system for use at a surgical site (Figures 1 and 2) comprising a fastener (anchoring element 12, wherein the ends of the fastener are the fastener "tips"), an occlusive device (lead element 14) in the form of a coil (column 5, lines 34-35) disposed adjacent to the fastener and in cooperation with the fastener (12) and the tips of the fastener via fibers (16a, 16b and 16c), and a penetration apparatus (introducing catheter 2; column 5, lines 35-36) in reversible communication with the fastener (12) and the occlusive device (used for delivery and withdrawal; column 6, lines 44-48). Figures 1 and 2 show the occlusive device expanded (uncompressed) into a substantially open configuration and collapsed (compressed) into a substantially closed configuration. Purdy discloses the fastener (12) fastens a first component (occlusive device 14) to a second component (the wall of a vessel; column 5, lines 36-38), and discloses the occlusive device (14), in cooperation with the fastener (12), reduces blood flow at the surgical site (column 5, lines 38-42). Purdy further discloses advancing the occlusive system (10) to a surgical site and deploying the occlusive system (10) to reduce the loss of blood at the surgical site (column 5, lines 40-42).

7. Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (Patent No. 6,802,851 B2). Jones et al. disclose an occlusive system for use at a surgical site (Figure 11) comprising a fastener (14/12) and an occlusive device (coil 66), wherein the occlusive device (66) is disposed within the fastener (column 3, lines 22-40, 49-53, and column 4, lines 5-13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purdy. Purdy discloses a device as described above, however, Purdy does not disclose the occlusive device comprises a band, a ribbon, a valve, and a flap. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device in the shape or form of a band, a ribbon, a valve, and a flap. Applicant has not disclosed that an occlusive device in the shape or form of a band,

ribbon, valve, provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well in the form of a coil because the function of the device is to reduce the loss of blood at a surgical site, and the coil of Purdy performs this function. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the shape and/or form of the device of Purdy to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6-9.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie Tyson whose telephone number is (571) 272-9062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 9:00 a.m. - 6:30 p.m., alternate Fridays 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Melanie Tyson *MT*
December 5, 2005

ANHTUANT.NGUYEN
ANHTUANT.NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

12/8/05